

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 1-6, objected to 7-25 and 27 and rejected claims 7-28. Claims 7 and 22-28 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Thus, claims 1-28 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

*** **

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned before acting on the case, if there are any pending matters, in order to expedite prosecution of the application.

*** **

ALLOWED CLAIMS:

At item 11 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-6 are allowed.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER:

At item 12 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 7-25 and 27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection under § 112 and § 101. Claims 7, 22-25 and 27 are amended herein and no longer contain language rejected by the Examiner. Claims 8-21 depend from claim 7.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-25 and 27 are allowable.

OBJECTION TO THE SPECIFICATION:

At item 3 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the Specification. Pertinent claims are amended herein for clarification. It is submitted that the Specification provides proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 7 AND 22-28:

At item 4 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 7 and 22-28 due to informalities.

The objected claims 7 and 22-28 are amended herein to recite, "... automatically updating a shared directory..." and/or "a computer readable storage medium." Claims 8-21

depend from claim 7.

Therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112:

In the outstanding Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 7-28 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph.

As mentioned above, claims 7 and 22-28 are amended herein to recite, "... automatically updating a shared central subscriber directory used... by different autonomous telephony messaging systems to route subscriber messages." Claims 8-21 depend from claim 7.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101:

Claims 23-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 23-26 have been amended, and no longer include the language in the form rejected by the Examiner.

Independent claims 24 and 25 are amended to recite "a processor", support for which can be found at least in FIG. 1, including corresponding text describing a processing unit (for example, APU 108) triggering or sending an update request. Claims 23 and 26 are also amended to comply with the requirements of § 101.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a):

In the outstanding Office Action the Examiner rejected claims 26 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,741,677 (Reformato) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,162,467 (Eshleman).

Per the Examiner's assertion, the prior art of record does not teach "automatically updating [a] shared central subscriber directory including corresponding voice messaging subscriber information based on the update request, where the updated shared central subscriber directory is used by the different autonomous telephony messaging systems to route subscriber voice messages" (see, page 9 of the outstanding Office Action).

Thus, Eshleman does not teach or suggest "automatically updating [a] shared centralized subscriber directory including voice messaging subscriber information based on the update request" and "using the updated shared centralized subscriber directory to route voice messages

by the different autonomous telephone voice messaging systems", as recited in claims 26 and 28 ("telephony messaging systems" in claim 28).

Instead, Eshleman only discusses individual updates to cache databases of remote server units (see, Figs. 3A and 3B including corresponding text).

On the other hand, Reformato only updates a record of a message waiting for a single subscriber such as indicating whether the message has been reviewed by the subscriber (see, col. 14, lines 23-36 and Fig. 5). Reformato does not teach or suggest "automatically updating [a] shared centralized subscriber directory" and "using the updated shared centralized subscriber directory to route voice messages by the different autonomous telephone voice messaging systems", as recited in claims 26 and 28.

At least on pages 3 and 8 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner stated that the combination of Reformato and Eshleman would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. However, there is no teaching, suggestion, or motivation to make the modification asserted by the Examiner. Specifically, absent hindsight, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Reformato directed to indicating in stored messages retrieval status of a message by the subscriber in accordance with the FIFO (First In First Out) queues in Eshleman pertaining to cache databases of remote server units, and vice versa.

Even assuming the combination, as acknowledged by the Examiner, the prior art of record (including the combination of Reformato and Eshleman) does not teach or suggest "automatically updating [a] shared centralized subscriber directory" and "using the updated shared centralized subscriber directory to route voice messages by the different autonomous telephone voice messaging systems", as recited in claims 26 and 28.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Serial No. 09/934,582

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 27, 2008

By: /Temnit Afework/
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501